I:Srinivas E-5 (1940-42)1952 AW5 Coorg AW5

caste families attached to it as slaves. This was again an hereditary relationship, and between families and not between individuals.

II

In Coorg the agnatically related males form a corporate body enjoying the bulk of the rights in the *okka*. Men, thanks to patrilocality, are assured of continuous residence in the *okka* to which they belong, whereas the women have to leave their natal *okka* on marriage and become members of their conjugal *okka*. The men have a sense of belonging to the *okka* which is absent in all but the oldest women. A girl has to leave her natal *okka* on marriage, and this break in residential continuity is an important factor having legal and other consequences. It takes a long time[1] for her to be accepted into her conjugal *okka*: only when her children are grown up does she have the assured sense of belonging to her conjugal *okka*.

Sons are the comfort and hope of parents. They are the pillars of the *okka*. They are the means by which the *okka* continues to exist, and the continuity of the *okka* is a matter of the most profound concern to the members. Daughters are destined to leave their natal *okkas* and the children that are born to them enrich and perpetuate a different *okka*.

A woman is not a member of an *okka* in the sense a man is, and the legal rights she enjoys are always inferior to a man's. There are compensations, however. A man enjoys his legal rights in one *okka*, whereas a woman enjoys hers in two, her natal and conjugal *okkas*. A girl is maintained in her natal *okka* till her marriage, or throughout her life if she decides to be a spinster. She has the right to return to her natal *okka* if, for example, her husband is impotent, or suffers from an incurable illness, or if her mother-in-law does not treat her properly. She has a right to return to her natal *okka* if she is divorced, assuming of course that she had not been divorced for a serious offence such as adultery with an Untouchable. Should she be guilty of such an offence she is thrown out of caste irrevocably and this means that she loses her rights in both her natal and her conjugal *okkas*.

At marriage her relatives give her gifts of jewellery, clothes, and vessels. These remain her property, and in the event of her divorce she brings them back to her natal *okka*.

[1] Cross-cousin marriage makes it easier for the girl to be absorbed into her conjugal *okka*.

2:Emeneau L-5 (1936-1937) 1938
AW5 Coorg AW5

614 587 first husband's sib are extinguished with the formulas given in Appendix I, and in her father's house she is given to her new husband with the sammanda ceremony. A woman regains a 614 586 permanent place in her original sib only by divorce. This may happen if she is grossly and persistently immoral or if she and her husband are continually at odds with one another (the former is much the more usual cause). In such cases the aruvës of the two families (see ref. [1], p. 130) negotiate between the two parties and if both families agree to a divorce, the woman relinquishes all claims to a place in her husband's sib and may never regain it by another marriage into that sib. She regains a place in her father's sib and keeps it, unless as rarely happens she should be sought in marriage by another man from another sib. My informant emphasized significantly that the woman is readmitted to her original sib not automatically but only if the sib is persuaded to agree to it. In the sammanda ceremony by a piece of symbolism the woman retains the right of readmission [585] to her original sib. The aruvë of the groom's party is given by her party eleven out of twelve pebbles; the remaining one is kept by her sib. This right to readmission is exercised in case [764] of divorce or of remarriage if her first husband dies. It carries with it only one other right in her father's sib, viz. if she should die in the house of her parents and the burial-ground of her husband's sib should be at an inconvenient distance, she may be buried [851] in that of her father's sib. Children by a woman's first husband always remain members of his sib, whether or not she leaves it by divorce or remarriage into another sib. If at the time of her leaving her husband's sib any children should be too young to fend for themselves, she may retain charge of them until they attain an age when they can care for themselves, when they return to the house of their own sib.

● C13 Marriage is forbidden also between a couple who are related to one another by descent through females only from a common female ancestor. There is not however among the Coorgs the same division of the people among female lines that I have elsewhere described for the Todas.[1] It seems probable from my informant's accounts that the relationships in female lines tend to be remembered for a comparatively small number of generations and even in some cases to be neglected when they are remembered, if it is considered that the degree of relationship is not close enough to hinder marriage. What degree would be considered distant enough to allow of intermarriage I could not elicit with any accuracy, but it seems that three or four degrees might be sufficiently distant, i.e. a relationship that is traced back through females to a common great-grandmother or great-great-grandmother. The proverb quoted in the fifth paragraph below refers also to this type of marriage. 2;

[1] American Anthropologist, 39, 103–112.

3/4 [see cat. 116, pp. 142–144 – Analyst] 2/4 [see p. 129]

2: Emeneau L-5 (1936-1937) 1938
AW5 Coorg AW5

which practise an asymmetrical form of cross-cousin marriage. Until we have exact ethnological and linguistic accounts of many more communities of the area than we have now, any correlations found between institutions and terminology must rest under suspicion of being in part accidental and not due to a coordinated development of the two. The kinship terminology of the Coorgs forms an appendix to this paper.

Within the group of the blood-relations of a man or woman, marriage is allowed only with the cross-cousin, either real or classificatory. This implies that within this group one may not marry except in his own generation. The matter was stressed by my informants, since in some of the Kannada-speaking communities a man may marry the daughter of his elder sister, and the Coorgs wished to point out that this is not allowable for themselves.

It will be evident from Appendix II dealing with kinship terminology that kinship terms are applied to many more people than actual blood-relations (see especially App. II, 7). The ramifications tend to become very wide-spread, especially when marriages take place outside of the blood-group, and when a man marries more than once; e.g. in the latter case, a man's stepmother is called cikavvĕ, her sister is called by the same term, the husband of this latter woman is ayyĕ, and his children, whether by this woman or by another wife, are called by terms for 'brother' and 'sister', though they are in no way blood-relations to oneself. It remains to ask whether in such cases the Coorgs apply in the field of marriage the dictum: like designations involve like social relations.[1] My informant (not the same gentleman from whom most of the information in this paper was obtained) said that the rule should apply that marriage is prohibited between any two persons who apply to one another brother-sister terms or terms denoting relationships between different generations. This rule however is not adhered to in practice and it was easy to call to mind in a few moments half-a-dozen cases where marriages had taken place between persons related in this way by terminology but unrelated in blood. The rules that must not be broken are those two stated above: the sibs are exogamous, and marriage is forbidden between a couple who are related to one another by descent from a common female ancestor through females only. On the history of this disregard of terminological relationships little information was gained. My informant's guess that it is due to the influence of education and the 'British example', and so is a very modern thing, is of little value. Of the cases mentioned none could have occurred more than half-a-century ago. But, since there was no mention of any opposition to any of these marriages, it is probable that such

[1] Lowie, *Primitive Society*, p. 148.